

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The title of the invention has been amended to be more indicative of the claimed subject matter.

Claim 39 has have been cancelled, and claims 33, 35-38, 40-47, and 49 have been amended. Support for the amendments is provided, for example, in paragraphs [0084] and [0085] of Applicants' published specification. (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

Claims 50 and 51 stand withdrawn as being directed to non-elected subject matter.

Claims 33, 35-37, and 45-47 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Adachi et al (US 6,983,167) in view of Gurbuz et al. (US 7,301,924). Claim 38 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of Gurbuz and LeBlanc et al. (US 5,508,707). Claims 39, 40, 42, and 43 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of Gurbuz and Patel et al. (US 6,865,185). Claim 41 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of Gurbuz and Karimi et al. (US 2001/0046882). Claims 44 and 49 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of Gurbuz, Patel, and Karaoguz (US 2004/0029620). To the extent the rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 33 now defines an access point that communicates with a station using a superframe having a beacon frame. The beacon frame identifies for the station whether an antenna type is a dynamic beam or a fixed beam. When the identified antenna type is the dynamic beam, the access point executes an unsupervised access mode so as to detect a new station in a reception space. Also, the access point executes the unsupervised access mode when the identified antenna type is the fixed beam and a rogue station is detected. The claimed subject matter provides the advantages of increasing the total throughput of a wireless local area network (WLAN) and facilitating the design and manufacture of low-priced user devices/stations with a simple and small form factor (see paragraphs [0016]-[0018] of Applicants' published specification).

The Office Action proposes that each of Adachi and Gurbuz disclose a superframe having a beacon frame (see Office Action page 3, lines 1-2, and page 3, line 20, through page 4, line 1).

However, neither Adachi nor Gurbuz disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter wherein a beacon frame of a superframe identifies an antenna type as either a dynamic beam or a fixed beam. And because Adachi and Gurbuz do not disclose a superframe that identifies an antenna type as either a dynamic beam or a fixed beam, it necessarily follows that Adachi and Gurbuz cannot disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter of executing a specific mode of accessing an access point based on the type of antenna identified in the superframe. More specifically, claim 33 recites that the access point executes an unsupervised access mode when an antenna type identified within a superframe is a dynamic beam and executes the unsupervised access mode when the identified antenna type is a fixed beam and a rogue station is detected in

the reception space. LeBlanc, Patel, Karimi, and Karaoguz are not cited in the Office Action for supplementing the teachings of Adachi and Gurbuz in this regard.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the teachings of Adachi, Gurbuz, LeBlanc, Patel, Karimi and Karaoguz, even if combined as proposed in the Office Action, still would lack the above-noted features of claim 33 and thus the references, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 33. Therefore, allowance of claim 33 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: March 29, 2010
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-05202
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559